DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 624 CS 507 527

AUTHOR Gayle, Barbara Mae; And Others
TITLE Sex Differences in Conflict Management Strategy Selection: A Meta-Analytic Review.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (41st, Chicago, IL, May 23-27, 1991). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Conflict; Conflict Resolution; Information Theory; Interpersonal Communication; Literature Reviews; Meta Analysis; *Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Strategies; *Conflict Management Style

ABSTRACT

A meta-analysis examined sex-related differences in conflict styles to resolve some of the competing claims about the existence, antecedents, and nature of these differences. To explore the effect of biological sex on the selection of conflict management strategies (CMS), existing studies relevant to sex differences in the selection of CMS were aggregated, and meta-analytic and narrative reviews of the experimental literature were conducted. Results indicated that although men were somewhat more competitive and women were somewhat more compromising, the average effect sizes were small. Findings indicated that the sex of the disputants plays a small, but definite role in the selection of competitive and compromising conflict management strategies. No differences were observed in the selection of avoiding, accommodating, and collaborating strategies. (Four tables of data are included; 63 references are attached.) (Author/PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334624

Sex differences in conflict management strategy selection: A meta-analytic review.

by

Barbara Mae Gayle
Department of Communication Studies
University of Portland
5000 N. Willamette Blvd.
Portland, OR 97203-5798

Raymond W. Preiss
Department of Communication Studies
University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, WA 98416

and

Mike Allen
Department of Communication
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Running Head: Sex differences in CMS

1991

ICA Chicago

CS507527

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mike Allen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

Sex-related differences in conflict styles have long been a subject of controversy. Researchers make competing claims about the existence, antecedents, and nature of these differences. In an effort to resolve these issues, meta-analytic and narrative reviews of the experimental literature on sex differences in the selection of conflict management strategies were conducted. Results indicate that although men were somewhat more competitive and women were somewhat more compromising, the average effect sizes were small. These findings indicate that the sex of the disputants plays a small, but definite role in the selection of competitive and compromising conflict management strategies. No differences were observed in the selection of avoiding, accommodating, and collaborating strategies.

Sex differences in conflict management strategy selection: A meta-analytic review

Researchers have devoted over 20 years to studying sex-based differences in the selection of conflict management strategies. Unfortunately, the conditions under which women and men differ or are similar in their selection of conflict management strategies are not well understood. Much of the controversy over the effect of biological sex on conflict-related behaviors assumes that men and women's behaviors differ stereotypically. Acceptance of sex stereotypes produces only marginally informative generalizations (e.g., Men are more task-oriented and competitive. Women are more relationally-oriented and compromising).

In studies focusing on sex-linked conflict behaviors, most researchers hypothesize that males use more competitive or win/lose type strategies and females use more compromising or win\win type strategies. Overall findings, however, do not provide consistent support for sex-based stereotypes. While some studies[1] identify sex as a salient issue, researchers do not agree on patterns of, or situations

involving, sex-related differences in conflict management behaviors. In addition to producing a fragmented pattern of empirical findings, researchers advancing the stereotypical view have not satisfactorily accounted for the limited ability of sex to predict conflict behavior. The inability to replicate sex-based conflict patterns has been noted in various settings using different sample populations (Konovosky, Jaster, & McDonald, 1988; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1984).

Disagreement over stereotypic views of conflict management behaviors stems from body of research failing to identify sex-related conflict behaviors. Several studies[2] find that men and women employ quite similar conflict management strategies. The ambiguity of 'sex-appropriate' conflict behavior and the value-laden nature of generalizations based on crude sexual stereotypes undercuts the ability of researchers to conclude whether men and women employ unique conflict-solving styles. Additionally, conditions under which these styles might be implemented may differ between the sexes. This review provides a summary of the sex

differences and conflict management strategy (CMS) selection literature.

THEORETICAL ISSUES IN THE CMS LITERATURE

Two rationales have been offered to account for the contradictory findings in the sex-conflict style literature. One explanation argues that conflict strategy selection is embedded in sex stereotypes. From this vantage, conflict management is affected by expectations based on sexual stereotypes. A second approach views CMS selection as resulting from features of a conflict context. Both approaches have produced a body of supporting literature and offer insight into sex-based differences and similarities in conflict management.

Expectancy Account for Conflict Strategy Selection

The popular explanation for conflict differences is found in expectancy theory. This approach reasons that males and females communicate according to their perceptions of societally defined roles. From this view, males behave more aggressively and dominantly, and females are defined as submissive and pacifying (Burgoon, Dillard, & Doran, 1983; Rotter, 1955;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Williams & Best, 1982). Role behaviors are "the reoccurring actions of an individual appropriately interrelated with the repetitive activities of others so as to yield predictable outcomes" (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 174). Role expectations are normative prescriptions for, or criteria which, represent societally acceptable behaviors consistent with one's sex role. This approach suggests that men and women relate to one another stereotypically during a conflict interaction. Presumably, males select more competitive strategies to reflect their aggressive nature. Females compromise and accommodate more frequently due to a feminine focus on maintaining relationships.

Support for the expectancy theory has been found in a variety of settings (organizations; universities) and sample populations (supervisors/subordinates; students; intimates). Research on organizational conflict provides evidence supporting expectancy theory, although no identifiable, consistent strategy exists. Thomas (1971), Nadler and Nadler (1988), and Euwema and Van de Vliert (1990) conclude that women managers are less forcing and competitive, instead they

compromise more often than male mangers in conflict situations. Ruble and Stander (1990) support these findings in workplace conflicts, but find no differences between women and men's conflict management strategy choices in non-task situations. Sone (1981) and Konovosky, Jaster, and McDonald (1988), on the other hand, conclude that female managers and employees used more accommodating strategies because they found no differences with male employees and managers. Rossi and Todd-Mancillas (1987) and Kofron (1986) found only that male managers and employees used more competitive strategies and could not identify any particular strategy-use among females.

These contradictory findings in organizational conflicts caused Rahim (1983) to approach the issue differently. He found that the sex of the respondent could correctly identify the strategy used in 62% of the cases, but he had trouble identifying a person's sex using competitive strategies. Thus, Rahim concluded that females were more compromising, collaborative, avoiding, and less accommodating than males.

Support for expectancy theory has been especially prevalent in studies using students as a sample population. Nevertheless, research has not identified consistent strategy usage patterns involving males or females. Kilmann and Thomas (1977), Chanin and Schneer (1984), Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984), Ting-Toomey (1986), Berryman-Fink and Bruner (1987), and Schuekle and McDowell (1990), using students as a sample population, found that females used more compromising strategies, while males used more competitive strategies. Goering (1986) found only that female students were more compromising, not that males were more competitive. Roloff and Greenberg (1979) used high school students as a sample population and found that males were more likely to use antisocial strategies whereas females used only one antisocial strategy (crying or pleading). Baxter and Shepherd (1978) used gender differences in their study of college students and found that masculine- and androgynous-classified students approved of more competitive behaviors than feminine-classified students, but isolated no preference for compromising strategy use.

Several researchers investigating conflict interactions in intimate relationships found support for the expectancy theory, but no consistent pattern of strategy-use by men and women emerged. Bell, Chafetz, and Horn (1982) concluded that although men and women used similar strategies in marital conflicts, men win more frequently. Yelsma and Brown (1985) found that respondents who could be classified as occupying feminine gender roles in marital disagreements were more accommodating and compromising. Ugbah and DeWine (1986) concluded that females involved in dissolving an intimate relationship use nonconfrontation and solution-orientation strategies much more than males.

Support for the expectancy theory was also identified when the sex of the other person involved in the conflict effect was researched. Fitzpatrick and Winke (1979) concluded that male and female college students differed in the types of conflict management strategy selected with their same sex friends. Males engage more competitive strategies while females try to resolve differences by using personal rejection, emotional appeals, and empathic understanding.

Zammutto, London and Rowland (1979) argue that males reporting to males withdrew from conflicts more than males reporting to females. Further, males reporting to males were less likely to be confrontational or competitive than females reporting to females.

Conclusions Regarding Expectancy Theory

No real pattern emerges from the research attempting to identify sex differences in CMS. It is apparent that, even if researchers identify sex differences, there are still basic differences in the particular strategies attributed to male and female respondents. At this point, the direction of effects is equivocal and no attempt to quantify the magnitude of outcomes linked to stereotypical expectations for conflict styles exists.

Interaction-Conflict Account for CMS

The interaction-conflict account deals with the contextual, situational and personality variables of constituting the conflict environment. In conflict environments where the context and or situation is compelling, few stylistic differences will be expected between males and females. A rationale for this

finding is based on Deaux's (1977) idea of sex as a social category. Deaux and Majors (1987) suggest that situational determinants are more likely to account for behavior rather than "true" sex differences. They argue that sex differences are not stable outcomes of a variable akin to personality characteristics. Rather, contextual issues would play the key role in determining male and female preferences for conflict behaviors. Participants in conflict interactions may make choices about conflict management strategy selection by considering their own and the other person's goals (Putnam & Wilson, 1982), their past interactions in relationships (Yelsma, 1988), their own value systems (Thomas, 1988), or situational/contextual factors (Deaux & Majors, 1987; Knapp, Putnam, & Davis, 1988; Renwick, 1977; Shockley-Zalabak, 1981; Thomas, 1988; Womack, 1988). If alternative factors are salient for both men and women, few differences in CMS would be anticipated. This may account for the findings of ten studies that conclude women and men employ similar CMS.

In organizational settings, Chusmir and Mills

(1989), Gayle (in press), Howell (1981), Shockley-Zalabak (1981), Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984), Revilla (1984), Renwick (1977), and Temkins and Cummings (1986) concluded that males and females employ similar conflict management strategies. Nowak (1984), investigating marital conflict interactions, found that sex-role-identified individuals as well as biological-sex-identified individuals use similar conflict management strategies. Sternberg and Soriano (1984) investigated whether personality characteristics and situational variables as well as sex differences affects the choice of conflict management strategies by college students. They found that male and female students employed basically identical strategies.

Conclusions Regarding the Interactional-Context Account

The literature consistent with the interactional approach is difficult to interpret. One compelling problem relates to confirmation of the null hypothesis. The failure to find hypothesized sex-linked conflict outcomes hardly justifies the conclusion that the context governs conflict management selection strategies. However, when a pattern of

similar male-female outcomes is detected, it is reasonable to search for alternative interpretations. The interactional-context account provides such an alternative.

The interactional-context explanation if viable, must specify features of the situation/ context leading to similarities or differences in the selection of conflict strategies. This precision of prediction has not emerged in the literature. Instead, studies find similar patterns <u>across</u> experimental contexts. If situational variables are operating, this means that micro-contextual issues (power, inequality, formality, norms, organization structure, grievance procedures, etc.) remain concealed within macro-categories addressed by existing literature (marital conflict, organizational conflict, roommate conflict, etc.).

Although considerable attention has been devoted to investigating the impact that sex has on CMS selection, little progress has been made in resolving contradictory findings. Our review of sex differences in CMS selection reveals a fragmented body of literature replete with theoretical inconsistencies.

Because meta-analysis can statistically synthesize a number of original studies and lead to generalizable conclusions (Crehan, 1985; Rosenthal, 1984), investigating this literature meta-analytically can reconcile contradictory results.

METHOD

To explore the effect of biological sex on the selection of conflict management strategies, existing studies relevant to sex differences in the selection of CMS were aggregated. By coding and transforming outcomes into a common metric, it is possible to combine results across these studies, estimate an average effect size, and detect moderator variables. Meta-analysis can resolve conflicting research findings. The technique quantifies the empirical features of a body of literature (Cooper, 1984; Glass, McGraw, & Smith, 1981; Light & Pillemer, 1984) such as the effect of sex on the selection of conflict management strategies.

Search Procedures

For this investigation, a large sample of studies examining sex differences and the selection of conflict

management strategies was gathered. An extensive search of the literature was initiated by manual and computer searches of Social Sciences Citation Index, Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts International, ERIC, ABI/Inform, Management Contents Database, Business Index, and Index to Journals in Speech Communication from 1965 to 1989. Other studies were identified by searches of the International Communication Association, Speech Communication Association, and Western Speech Communication Association convention programs.

Each study was subjected to inclusion rules for aggregation. A report was included if it:

(a) was an experimental investigation providing enough statistical information to allow calculation of an effect size;

(b) reported a relationship relevant to the impact of biological sex on the selection of conflict management strategies.

Coding Procedures

The search procedures and coding system resulted in the location of 34 studies relevant to the variables of interest. Basic information regarding each study is found in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Five studies did not provide sufficient statistical information to allow meta-analytic cumulation (Fitzpatrick & Winke, 1979; Nowak, 1984; Rahim, 1983, Roloff & Greenberg, 1979; Sternberg & Soriano, 1984). The remaining 29 studies were subjected to meta-analytic procedures.

Studies were coded for outcomes relevant to basic conceptual conflict management strategies. The traditional five-factor model was employed as coding categories: avoid, accommodate, compete, compromise, collaboration (Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Statistical Procedures

The summary statistics of each study were converted to correlations so that the magnitude of outcomes attributable to sex differences in conflict management strategy selection could be quantified. A positive correlation (a randomly assigned designation) indicates that male means were higher on a particular strategy, while a negative correlation indicates female

means were higher. The benchmark for evaluating the effect size is found in Cohen (1977): r = .10 is a small effect; r = .30 is a medium effect; r = .50 is a large effect.

The correlations were weighted for sample size and then averaged. Each average correlation was assessed to determine if the variance in the observed sample correlations was larger than that expected by random sample error (Hedges & Olkin, 1985).

This variance centered meta-analysis was selected because of its high power for detecting moderator variables. A finding that significantly more variance exists in the sample of observed correlations than can be attributed to random sampling error indicates that the effect sizes are heterogenous. Heterogenous variance suggests that the average correlation does not represent the average of a single sample of correlations, in which case a moderator variable probably exists. To detect a moderator, the sum of the squared error should be tested using a chi-square test. A nonsignificant chi-square indicates that the amount of variability is probably the result of chance,

whereas a significant chi-square indicates that the amount of variability is the result of some type of moderating variable.

The search for moderator variables was guided by issues frequently cited in the sex differences and conflict management strategy selection literature. One issue is the sample population used. Konovosky, Jaster, and McDonald (1988), Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984) suggest that sex differences are more likely to be identified using college students as a sample population. Consequently, studies were coded for sample characteristics. A second issue involves the current instruments used to measure conflict management strategy selection. These scales fail to show high convergence with other measures of the same, and theoretically similar, constructs (Wilson & Waltman, 1988; Womack, 1988). Therefore both the type of scale and the method were coded and tested as moderating variables.

Other issues that were coded and examined as moderators included the sex of the author(s) and publication bias. Rosenthal (1976) suggests that the

biological sex of authors may affect the identification of sex differences. Because some critics of meta-analysis suggest that published and unpublished studies differ in direction and magnitude of effect (Rosenthal, 1984; Wolf, 1986) this factor was included in the check for moderator variables.

RESULTS

The effect sizes for each conflict management strategy reported in all studies are listed in Table 3.

Insert Table 2 about here

Overall, findings reveal small average effect sizes for each of the five conflict strategies. The effect sizes are grouped into CMS categories and displayed in Table 4.

Insert Table 3 about here

Avoid

Twenty-five studies employing 4,267 respondents investigated sex differences in the use of avoiding

strategies. The average correlation was not significant across studies (r = -.034). A formal significance test confirmed that the amount of variation is probably the results of chance, rather than the existence of some type of moderator variable (x^2 = 23.81, df = 24, p > .05).

Accommodate

Twenty-four studies employing 3,703 respondents investigated the use of accommodating strategies. The average effect size attributable to sex was small (r= -.061). The formal significance test indicated no moderator variables (x^2 = 16.80, df = 23, p > .05).

Compete

The average effect size between sex and competitive strategy selection (r = .119) was positive. The positive direction means that for the 4,407 respondents in 27 studies, males more frequently employ this strategy than females. A formal significance test for moderator variables was not significant (x^2 = 34.45, df = 26, p > .05).

Compromise

The meta-analysis revealed a negative average

effect size (r = -.119) between sex and compromising as a conflict management strategy. This suggests that females use compromising strategies more frequently than males. Twenty-eight studies employing 4,551 respondents investigated compromising strategies. The formal significance test found no indication of moderator variables (x^2 = 27.48, *df* = 27, *p* > .05).

Collaborate

Twenty-five studies employing 4,267 respondents examined the relationship between sex and collaborative strategies. The meta-analysis did not reveal a significant average effect size (r = -.022) between the two variables. However, the formal significance test indicated the presence of a moderator variable (x^2 = 39.11, *df* = 24, *p* = < .05). In an effort to locate the moderator, formal significance tests were conducted based on sex of the author, sample population, measurement scale, conflict stimulus, and publication status. The search for the particular moderating variable was inconclusive: no moderator was discovered.

DISCUSSION

In this investigation, the magnitude of the

average effect sizes varied substantially. Generally, biological sex plays a minor role in the selection of conflict management strategies. A growing body of meta-analyses, cumulating hundreds of studies with tens of thousands of participants, reach the conclusion that biological sex is not the major variable suggested by expectancy theory. Meta-analyses on organizational leadership (Dobbins & Platz, 1986), helping behavior (Eagly & Crowley, 1986), aggressive behavior (Eagly & Steffen, 1986), nonverbal communication (Hall, 1984), and identification of emotional states (Shapiro & Penrod, 1986) have not found evidence of major differences attributable to sex (Shibley Hyde & Linn, 1986). The results of this investigation indicate some small differences in the selection of conflict management strategies.

Sex-based differences were detected for the strategies of competition and compromise. Although the average effects were small, males employed more competitive strategies and females employed more compromising strategies. These results may be interpreted using the Binomial Effect Size Display

(Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982). Our meta-analysis reveals that males are 27% more likely than females to use competitive strategies and females are 27% more likely than males to use compromising strategies. In these areas, the meta-analysis offers limited support for expectancy theory.

Insert Table 4 about here

The influence of sex differences was not meaningful for avoiding, accommodating, and collaborating strategies. These results were generally more supportive of Deaux's (1977) and Deaux and Majors' (1987) theory that sex is a social category and the choice of conflict management strategies may be influenced by contextual, situational, or personal considerations. The search for moderator variables did not reveal any conclusive evidence that the sample population, type of instrument used to measure conflict management strategy selection, method employed, sex of the author(s), or publication status, influenced the findings in any way. Thus, the findings of this study

lend some credence to the idea that individuals employ stable conflict management strategies across varying situations and contexts. The conflict model that emerges suggests that regardless of contextual or situational constraints, females engage more frequently in integrative or compromising styles which Sillars (1981) claims facilitates greater conflict resolution and relational satisfaction. Males, on the other hand, tend to employ more distributive or competitive type strategies that promote individual outcomes through concession-seeking behavior.

The results suggest that integrative and distributive strategies may be separate orientations intrinsically tied to sex-roles rather than processes that emerge over the length of the conflict interaction. These results suggest that males and females relate to other individuals in conflict situations first on the basis of stereotypes. The predisposition for females to employ slightly more integrative or relationally-oriented strategies and males to use slightly more distributive or win-lose type strategies as the foundation of their conflict

management repertoire suggests a starting point for developing a processual model of conflict interactions. The real question is when and why males and females move beyond those stereotypes and what makes that movement possible during an interaction.

The meta-analysis focused on biological sex differences and made no attempt to separately aggregate and compare the few studies that pursue gender-related differences in the selection of conflict management strategies. Perhaps studies investigating masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated traits will clarify the use of integrative and distributive tactics (Stockard & Lach, 1989). This approach seems more promising than the study of biological sex in conflict settings.

FOOTNOTES

Studies finding sex-based differences are Baxter and Shepherd (1978), Bell, Chafetz, and Horn (1982), Berryman-Fink and Bruner (1987), Chanin and Schneer (1984), Euwema and Van de Vliert (1990), Fitzpatrick and Winke (1979), Goering (1986), Kilmann and Thomas (1977), Kofron (1986), Konovosky, Jaster, and McDonald (1988), Nadler and Nadler (1988), Putnam and Wilson (1982), Rahim (1983), Roloff and Greenberg (1979), Rossi and Todd-Mancillas (1987), Ruble and Sander (1990), Schuekle and McDowell (1990), Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984), Sone (1981), Thomas (1971), Ting-Toomey (1986), Ugbah and DeWine (1986), Yelsma and Brown (1985), and Zammutto, London, and Rowland (1979).

Studies failing to find sex-based differences are Chusmir and Mills, (1989), Gayle (1989), Howell (1981), Nowak (1984), Renwick (1977), Revilla (1984), Shockley-Zalabak (1981), Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984), Sternberg and Soriano (1984), and Temkins and Cummings (1986).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Baxter, L. A., & Shepherd, T. L. (1978). Sex-role identity, sex of other, and affective relationship as determinants of interpersonal conflict-management styles. Sex Roles, 6, 813-825.

Bell, D. C., Chafetz, J. S., & Horn, L. H. (1982). Marital conflict resolution: A study of strategies and outcomes. Journal of Family Issues, 3, 111-131.

Berryman-Fink, C., & Bruner, C. C. (1987). The effects of sex of source and target on interpersonal conflict management styles. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 53, 38-48.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Burgoon, B. R., Dillard, J. P., & Doran, N. E. (1983). Friendly or unfriendly persuasion: The effects of violations of expectations by males and females. Human Communication Research, 10, 283-294.

Chanin, M. N., & Schneer, J. A. (1984). A study of relationship between Jungian personality dimensions and conflict-handling behavior. Human Relations, 37, 865-879.

Chusmir, L. H., & Mills, J. (1989). Gender differences in conflict resolution styles of managers: At work and at home. Sex Roles, 20, 149-163.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.

Cooper, H. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1980). Statistical versus traditional procedures for summarizing research findings. Psychological Bulletin, 87, 442-449.

Crehan, P. (1985). An exploration of the usefulness of Meta-analysis in educational administration. Administrative Quarterly, 21, 263-279.

Deaux, K. (1977). Sex differences. In T. Blass (Ed.), Personality variables in social behavior (pp. 357-377). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. Psychological Review, 94, 369-389.

Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in Leadership: How real are they? Academy of Management Review, 11, 118-127.

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 283-308.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 309-330.

Euwema, M. C., & Van de Vliert, E. (1990, June). The influence of sex on managers' perception, attribution, stress and behavior in conflict with their subordinates. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association for Conflict Management, Vancouver, BC

Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Winke, J. (1979). You always hurt the one you love: Strategies and tactics in interpersonal conflict. Communication Quarterly, 27, 3-11.

Gayle, B. M. (In press). Sex equity in conflict management in the workplace. Journal of Applied Communication Research.

Glass, G. V., McGraw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). Meta-analysis in social research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Goering, E. M. (1986, November). Context, definition, and sex of actor as variables in conflict management style. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal sex differences: Communication, accuracy, and expressive style. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). Statistical methods for meta-analysis. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Howell, J. L. (1981). The identification, description and analysis of competencies focused on conflict management in a human services organization: An exploratory study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations, New York: John Wiley.

Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "mode" instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37, 309-323.

Knapp, M. L., Putnam, L. L., & Davis, L. J. (1988). Measuring interpersonal conflict in organizations: Where do we go from here? Management Communication Quarterly, 1, 414-429.

Kofron, C. P. (1986). A structural perspective of interpersonal conflict management. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO.

Konovosky, M. A., Jaster, F., & McDonald, M. A. (1988, November). Using parametric statistics to explore the underlying structures of the Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE survey. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Light, R. L., & Pillemer, D. B. (1984). Summing up: The science of reviewing research. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nadler, M. K., & Nadler, L. B. (1988, November). Sex differences in perceptions of and orientations toward conflict resolving behaviors in the organizational environment. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Nowak, M. (1984). Conflict resolution and power seeking behavior of androgynous and traditional married couples. Unpublished doctoral dissertation Michigan State University, Ann Arbor, MI.

Putnam, L. L., & Wilson, C. E. (1982). Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 6 (pp. 629-652). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rahim, A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 368-376.

Renwick, P. A. (1977). Effects of sex differences on the perception and management of conflict: An exploratory study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, 403-415.

Revilla, V. M. (1984). Conflict management styles of men and women in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Roloff, M. E., & Greenberg, B. S. (1979). Sex differences in choice of modes of conflict resolution in real-life and television. Communication Quarterly, 27, 3-12.

Rosenthal, R. (1976). Experimenter effects in behavioral research. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Rosenthal, R. (1984). Meta-analytic procedures for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rosenthal, R. and Rubin, D. B. (1982). A simple general response display of magnitude of experiential effect. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 166-169.

Rossi, A. M., & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1987). Male and female differences in managing conflicts. In L. P. Stewart and S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), Communication, gender, and sex roles in diverse interaction contexts (pp. 96-104). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rotter, J. B. (1955). The role of the psychological situation in determining the direction of human behavior. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation (pp. 245-268). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Ruble, T. L., & Stander, N. E. (1990, June). Effects of role and gender on conflict-handling styles. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association for Conflict Management, Vancouver, BC.

Scheukle, D., & McDowell, E. (1990, June). A study of the relationship between willingness to communicate and preferred conflict strategy: Implications for teaching communication and conflict. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association in Dublin, Ireland.

Shapiro, P.n., & Penrod, S. (1986). Meta-analysis of facial identification studies. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 139-156.

Shibley Hyde, J., & Linn, M. C. (1986). The psychology of gender: Advances through meta-analysis. Baltimore, MR: The John Hopkins University press.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for utilization of conflict styles of managers in a work setting: An exploratory study. Public Personnel Management Journal, 10, 289-295.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Morley, D. D. (1984). Sex differences in conflict style preferences. Communication Research Reports, 1, 28-32.

Sillars, A. L. (1981). Attributions and interpersonal conflict resolution. In J. H. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New Direction in Attribution Research, 3,(pp. 279-305). New York: Erlbaum.

Sone, P. G. (1981). The effects of gender on managers' resolution of superior-subordinate conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Sternberg, R. J., & Soriano, L. J. (1984). Styles of conflict resolution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 115-126.

Stockard, J., & Lach, D. (1989). Conflict resolution and sex and gender roles. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Temkins, T., & Cummings, H. W. (1986). The use of conflict management behaviors in voluntary organizations: An exploratory study. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15, 5-18.

Thomas, K. W. (1971). Conflict-handling modes in interdepartmental relations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Thomas, K. W. (1988). The conflict-handling modes: Toward more precise theory. Management Communication Quarterly, 1, 430-436.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1986). Conflict communication styles in black and white subjective cultures. In Y. Y. Kim (Ed.), Interethnic Communication: Current Research (pp. 75-88). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ugbah, S. D., & DeWine, S. (1986, November). Conflict management and relational disengagement: Are the communication strategies the same? Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago.

U. S. Bureau of Census (1988). Statistical abstract of the United States (108th ed.). Washington, DC.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty nation study. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Wilson, S. R., & Waltman, M. S. (1988). Assessing the Putnam-Wilson Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI). Management Communication Quarterly, 1, 367-386.

Wolf, F. M. (1986). Meta-analysis: Quantitative methods for research synthesis. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Womack, D. F. (1988). A review of conflict instruments in organizational settings. Management Communication Quarterly, 1, 437-445.

Yelsma, P. (1988, May). Organizational conflict management: A comparison of three self-report instruments. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Yelsma, P., & Brown, C. T. (1985). Gender roles, biological sex, and predisposition to conflict management. Sex Roles, 12, 28-32.

Zammutto, M. L., London, M., & Rowland, K. W. (1979). Effects of sex on commitment and conflict resolution. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 227-231.

TABLE 1. Sex Differences and Conflict Management Strategy Selection Vital Statistics

Author(s) of Study	Year Completed	Sex Differences Identified	Publication Status
Baxter & Shepherd	1978	Yes	Published
Bell, Chafetz & Horn	1982	Yes	Published
Berryman-Fink & Bruner	1987	Yes	Published
Chanin & Schneer	1984	Yes	Published
Chusmir & Mills	1989	No	Published
Euwema & Van de Vliert	1990	Yes	Convention
Fitzpatrick & Winke	1979	Yes	Published
Gayle	1989	No	Dissertation
Goering	1986	Yes	Convention
Howell	1981	No	Dissertation
Kilmann & Thomas	1977	Yes	Published
Kofron	1986	Yes	Dissertation
Konovosky, Jaster & McDonald	1988	Yes	Convention
Nadler & Nadler	1988	Yes	Convention
Nowak	1984	No	Dissertation
Putnam & Wilson	1982	Yes	Published

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Table 1. Continued)

Author(s) of Study	Year Completed	Sex Differences Identified	Publication Status
Rahim	1983	Yes	Published
Renwick	1977	No	Published
Revilla	1984	No	Dissertation
Roloff & Greenberg	1979	Yes	Published
Rossi & Todd-Mancillas	1987	Yes	Published
Ruble & Strander	1990	Yes	Convention
Schuekle & McDowell	1990	No	Convention
Shockley-Zalabak	1981	No	Published
Shockley-Zalabak & Morley	1984	No / Yes	Published
Sone	1981	Yes	Dissertation
Sternberg & Soriano	1984	No	Published
Temkins & Cummings	1986	No	Published
Thomas	1971	Yes	Dissertation
Ting-Toomey	1986	Yes	Published
Ugbah & Dewine	1986	Yes	Convention
Yelsma & Brown	1985	Yes	Published
Zammuto, London & Rowland	1979	Yes	Published

(Table 1. Continued)

Author(s) of Study	Sample Population	Method Used	Author(s) Sex	Sample Size
Baxter & Shepherd	College Students	MODE	Female	57
Bell, Chafetz & Horn	Married Couples	Interview	Both	60
Berryman-Fink & Bruner	College Students	MODE	Female	147
Chanin & Schneer	College Students	MODE	Both	94
Chusmir & Mills	Managers	MODE	Both	201
Euwema & Van de Vliert	Employees	Survey	Male	215
Fitzpatrick & Winke	College Students	Survey	Both	170
Gayle	Managers/ Employees	OCCI	Female	304
Goering	College Students	Survey	Female	22
Howell	Managers & Employees	Survey	Male	52
Kilmann & Thomas	HighSchool & College	MODE	Male	205
Kofron	Managers & Employees	MODE	Male	300
Konovosky, Jaster & McDonald	Employees	MODE	Both	586
Nadler & Nadler	Managers & Employees	Scenario	Both	160
Nowak	Married Couples	Interview	Female	40
Putnam & Wilson	Employees	OCCI	Both	120

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Table 1. Continued)

Author(s) of Study	Sample Population	Method Used	Author(s) Sex	Sample Size
Rahim	Managers	Survey	Male	100
Renwick	Managers	Survey	Female	95
Revilla	Employees/ Managers	MODE	Female	113
Roloff & Greenberg	HighSchool Students	Survey	Male	175
Rossi & Todd-Mancillas	Managers	Scenarios	Both	80
Ruble & Stander	Employees	MODE	Male	62
Schuekle & McDowell	Students	OCCI	Male	217
Shockley-Zalabak	Managers	Survey	Female	69
Shockley-Zalabak & Morley	College Students	MODE	Both	61
	Managers & Employees	MODE	Both	100
Sone	Employees	Survey	Male	110
Sternberg & Soriano	College Students	Survey	Male	32
Temkins & Cummings	Managers & Employees	OCCI	Both	162
Thomas	Managers	Survey	Male	253
Ting-Toomey	College Students	OCCI	Female	303
Ugbah & Dewine	College Students	Survey	Both	175
Yelsma & Brown	Married Couples	Survey	Male	182
Zammuto, London & Rowland	College Students	Survey	Male	106

TABLE 2. Effect Sizes and Variances: Sex of Respondent

Author(s) of Study	Effect Size & Variance By Strategy AV	AC	CP	CM	CL
Baxter & Shepherd	-.000	-.106	.394	-.106	-.106
Bell, Chafetz & Horn			.270		
Berryman-Fink & Bruner	-.020	-.074	.171	-.180	-.130
Chanin & Schneer	.012	.042	.064	-.297	.220
Chusmir & Mills	-.119	-.071	.142	-.123	.116
Euwema & Van de Vliert	-.052	.007	.166	-.132	-.007
Gayle	-.106	-.055	.212	-.147	-.000
Goering				-.520	
Howell	.071	-.233	.209	-.081	-.235
Kilmann & Thomas	.069	-.069	.098	-.104	.098
Kofron	-.119	-.070	.173	-.070	.005
Konovosky, Jaster & McDonald	-.080		-.005	-.040	-.040
Nadler & Nadler	.153		.181	-.199	.181
Putnam & Wilson	-.013	-.013	.030	-.129	.129
Renwick	-.155	.056	-.075	-.200	.152
Revilla	-.191	.034	.071	.028	.019
Rossi & Todd-Mancillas			.000	-.210	
Ruble & Stander	-.125	-.125	.250	-.329	-.125
Scheukle & McDowell	-.002	-.002	.123	-.200	-.200
Shockley-Zalabak	-.000	-.000	.000	-.000	.000
Shockley-Zalabak	.000	.000	.235	-.289	-.000
& Morley	.000	-.000	.112	-.057	.000
Sone	-.042	-.246	.157	-.172	-.098
Temkins & Cummings	-.000	.000	.000	-.000	-.000
Thomas	-.033	-.040	.154	-.126	.044
Ting-Toomey	.000	-.108	.160	-.108	.000
Ugbah & Dewine	-.189	-.184	.059	-.189	-.184
Yelsma & Brown		-.088		-.088	
Zammuto, London & Rowland	-.034	-.164	.261	-.017	-.164

AV = Avoid, AC = Accommodation, CP = Compete, CM = Compromise, CL = Collaboration, NO = Nonconfrontation, SO = Solution-Orientation

Table 3. Average Effect Sizes

	r	N	K	Chi-Square
Avoid	-.034	4267	25	23.81
Accommodate	-.061	3703	24	16.80
Compete	.119	4407	27	34.45
Compromise	-.119	4551	28	27.48
Collaborate	-.022	4267	25	39.11*

* $p < .05$

Table 4. Binominal Effect Size Display

Compromise:

Female	56%	44%
Male	44%	56%
	High	Low

r = .119

Compete:

Female	56%	44%
Male	44%	56%
	High	Low

r = .119